DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 408 062 PS 025 464

AUTHOR Hayden, Jacqueline
TITLE Directors of Early Childhood Services: Experience, Preparedness and Selection.
PUB DATE 97
NOTE 14p.; For the complete proceedings, see PS 025 459.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
JOURNAL CIT Journal of Australian Research in Early Childhood Education; v1 p49-61 1997
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Behavior; Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Role; *Administrators; Child Care Occupations; Child Caregivers; Day Care; Day Care Centers; *Early Childhood Education; Foreign Countries
IDENTIFIERS Australia (New South Wales)

ABSTRACT

The role of the early childhood director has been a neglected area of research in Australia. This study set out to address the gap in understanding of directors and the administration/management function in child care and preschool settings. Through a survey of practicing directors and a series of follow-up interviews with selected respondents, baseline data were gathered which identified the background, experience, means of recruitment, levels of satisfaction, training needs, and other concerns of administrators in a representational sample of preschool and child care centers in New South Wales. Results showed that while the cohort overall has experience in a director's role, 41 percent of directors worked in the field for less than two years before taking on the role of director. Administrators rated in-service training as much more useful than pre-service degrees or courses. Most stated that they had a full understanding of their position, or that they knew most things about it, before taking it on. A majority of respondents identified technical and human relations issues as the most difficult for them as new directors, but almost half also claimed that these issues were the ones for which they were best prepared. Most directors were motivated to pursue their positions because of their desire for a change or challenge or because of positive impressions about the job or inspiration from a specific role model. Only 5 percent were pursuing their position for the salary. Almost one-third of respondents were appointed without going through competition processes. Overall, the majority of directors reported a strong personal and professional commitment to the management role, and they reported success at foraging out their own information and support resources. (Contains 25 resources.) (EV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 408 062

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

DIRECTORS OF EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES: EXPERIENCE, PREPAREDNESS AND SELECTION

Jacqueline Hayden
University of Western Sydney, Nepean

ABSTRACT

The early childhood Director has been a neglected area of research in Australia. This study set out to address the gap in our understanding of Directors and the administration/management function in child care and preschool settings. Through a survey of practicing Directors and a series of follow up interviews with selected respondents, baseline data were gathered which identified the background, experience, means of recruitment, levels of satisfaction, training needs and other concerns of administrators in a representational sample of preschool and child care centres in New South Wales. While the increasing complexity of the role of the Director has not been reflected by training opportunities, wage allotments, time allowances, or government policies, Directors reported success at foraging out their own information and support resources. Despite difficulties, the majority of Directors reported a strong personal and professional commitment to the management role in the field of early childhood care and education. This paper reports the findings related to four areas: experience and commitment of Directors; levels of training; methods of recruitment and selection; and feelings of preparedness for assuming the role of Director.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Fleer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

INTRODUCTION

While structural components such as maximum group size, staff/child ratio and play space per capita are important indicators of the potential calibre of child care settings, it is becoming increasingly clear that 'process' components which make up the adult work environment have a powerful effect upon quality care in child care centres, and that the centre Director plays a lead role in developing and sustaining these processes.

Meanwhile, increased policy requirements, changes in funding procedures, frequent regulation reforms and increasing numbers of centres competing for clients and resources have greatly escalated the complexity of the task and the scope of responsibility for Directors. These changes have far reaching implications which have not been thoroughly researched. In fact, there is a considerable dearth in the literature on or about the Director's role and responsibilities in early childhood settings and particularly about the support and training needs of this group of practitioners.

This study set out to address the gap in our understanding of Directors and the administration/management function in early childhood settings which they perform. Through a survey of practicing Directors and a series of follow up interviews with selected respondents, baseline data were gathered which identified the background, experience, means of recruitment, level of preparedness and other issues related to Directors of early childhood services in a representational sample of preschool and child care centres in New South Wales.[1]

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Current research on quality in child care settings has moved from uni-dimensional check lists of indicators —staff ratios, group size, teacher training, space and equipment requirements (Roupp, Travers, Glantz & Coelen, 1979) to a more complex matrix which includes both 'structural' (measurable components of care giving) and 'process' factors such as consistency

PS 025464

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of care (low turnover rate), the quality of child/teacher interaction, appropriate programming and a number of other variables which, in combination, reflect the 'adult work environment' or 'organisational climate' of a setting (Howes, Phillip & Whitebook, 1992). Recent literature is demonstrating how good management practices create an organisational climate which is related to staff satisfaction and high quality service delivery and how poor management practices have opposing effects (Jorde Bloome, 1992).

In this way, the calibre of the adult work environment is now recognised as a critical predictor of quality care for young children. One of the most damaging aspects of a poor work environment is the departure of needed specialists from the field. Myriad studies point with alarm to an excessively high turnover rate in child care (Whelan, 1993; Schom Moffat, 1991; Jorde Bloome, 1992). Turnover has been associated with poorer rates of development in children, lower scores on the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (Phillips, 1987) and significant disruption affecting social and emotional advancements in infant and preschool aged children (Johnston, 1989). Turnover has also been associated with reduced responsiveness of caregivers and other reductions in caregiver/child interactions. Some of the derogatory effects of turnover stem from the lag time between staff leaving a centre and new staff being recruited. These lag times result in more work and increased stress for those who are still in the centre and inevitably cause a drop in morale, leading to a vicious circle of more turnover (Kontos & Feine, 1987).

Ryan has identified a financial cost to the community when turnover is high. She calculated that a turnover of 163 teachers from the field of early childhood education in Victoria in 1989 represented a loss of 'around one million dollars to train, not counting the loss of taxation revenue during their training' (Ryan, 1989:5).

The reasons for child care turnover have been reported extensively. Nearly all studies target the poor salary and low status associated with the field (see, for instance, Marx & Granger, 1990). More recent studies, however, are suggesting that the poor morale which precipitates turnover in child care settings is not merely the result of low wages but of other aspects relating to organisational climate (Whitebook, Howes, Phillips & Pemberton, 1989). The relationship of work environment to staff morale and turnover is particularly relevant in Australia where remuneration for child care specialists compares favourably to North America. Yet, despite their higher salaries, the rate of turnover for child care workers in Australia is as high or higher than counterparts with lower rates of pay and poorer working conditions. This implies that it is necessary to look beyond what Herzberg has called 'hygiene factors'[2] for causes of discontent in child care settings in Australia (Herzberg, 1975).

Sarros and Sarros analysed the types of burnout which lead to turnover and concluded that burnout is correlated to 'both organisational factors ... (and) the motivational needs of teachers to be challenged and rewarded by their work' (Sarros & Sarros, 1987). Similarly, in a study of 315 staff in long day care centres in New South Wales, 44 (11.3%) cited 'unresolved staff differences' as the reason for leaving their centre (Johnston, 1989). Staff conflict is associated with poor leadership and/or a lack of 'team work' in centres (Simons, 1986).

Whelan, meanwhile, identified management practice and heavy administration loads as one of the key reasons for the excessively high rate of turner of staff in child care centres in New South Wales (85% in two years). She concludes her extensive study of turnover by making recommendations for:

> *..flexibility and responsiveness in management style ... building a better staff-management team ... involving staff in decision making and other facets of good management practice.* (Whelan, 1993:71)

Sheerer and Jorde Bloom (1990) detail strategies which have been used by Directors of child care centres to reduce turnover. These include pre-hiring strategies such as carefully worded newspaper advertisements, interviewing that includes centre staff input and observation of the candidate interacting with children; and ongoing activities such as encouraging professional development, including staff in decision-making, providing flexible working conditions such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as job sharing, having a permanent substitute on staff and encouraging staff functions (Sheerer & Jorde Bloome, 1990).

Similarly, management theory from the corporate world has, in the past few decades, identified the primary importance of the on site 'leader' in creating a positive culture and developing motivation towards excellence in staff (Peters & Waterman, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1984). Morris (1981:2) compared staff turnover in primary schools where salary levels were consistent and found that:

> *Staff turnover was consistently higher at the less satisfying schools (and that) ... strong principal leadership emerged as a consistent factor in teacher satisfaction and motivation.*

The implication for child care is clear. Quality in service delivery is closely linked to the administration function of the early childhood setting and the Director is the 'key (person) to influence (both organisational effectiveness and) quality of care' (Caruso, 1991:20; see also Galinsky, 1986; Kelly, Croll & Godhard, 1989; Broinowski, 1991; Neugebaeur, 1989). The increasing recognition of the importance of the Director/leader calls for research about this role and about the characteristics of those who assume it.

In one such study involving 91 administrators, Croll, Lewis, Kelly and Godhard identified a number of common characteristics of Directors in child care centres in New South Wales. They found that child care Directors were older and more stable than other workers in this field. They worked long hours and had trouble fitting their responsibilities into a forty hour week. The average working day was nine hours and few Directors took a break for more than one half hour during the day (despite awards). Most time was reported to be spent on the less rewarding functional administrative and financial tasks at the cost of attention to program planning, child centred activities, staff development, parent development and other areas which were considered to be important by Directors. This study touched briefly upon the training support needs for Directors. The most outstanding finding was that the majority of early childhood Directors were not prepared for the increasing complexity of their role. The result of this lack of preparation and lack of support could be that crisis management prevailed. Meanwhile, the predominant child centred skills of the Directors were not being utilised as he/she spent larger amounts of time on other administrative tasks. This 'overload syndrome' may have caused Directors to forego professional development opportunities because they were loathe to 'take the time'. The authors of this study call for an investigation into ways whereby training and support for Directors could be increased (Croll, Lewis, Kelly & Godhard, 1993).

In his review of child care Directors in the USA, Caruso similarly noted the lack of training and support and concludes that:

> *It is very clear that Directors and other supervisors learn much of their supervisory craft through trial and error, experiencing great anxiety and, at time, pain in the process.*

He points out how the turnover rate of supervisors, although substantially lower than that for teachers or workers (average work span 5.5 years for Directors; 2.5 years for teachers; and 18 months for workers) was nonethless much greater than that for principals in the public school system (average span is 13 years).

It is clear that management/administration functions and the role and needs of the Director in child care settings warrant further investigation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EARLY CHILDHOOD DIRECTORS IN NEW SOUTH WALES

This section presents the finding from the analyses of Directors' roles and responsibilities within four categories. These are:

* experience and commitment
* training
* preparedness
* recruitment and selection of practicing Directors

Specific questions covering each area are listed below.

Methodology

Surveys were distributed to the Directors of all child care centres and preschools in the inner city and Western Sydney regions (N = 427). Two hundred and one questionnaires were returned (47%). Two surveys were returned too late to be added to the database. Five respondents indicated that they 'had no Director'. Two respondents stated that the survey was not relevant to their service. One respondent did not have official approval to fill out the questionnaire. One hundred and ninety-one questionnaires were used to compile findings. Not all questions were answered by all respondents. Interviews were conducted with 55 Directors selected randomly from the sample. The purpose of the interviews was to probe responses to survey questions.[3]

Sample

97 respondents called themselves long day care Directors.
93 respondents called themselves preschool Directors.
1 respondent called himself/herself an administrator.

Total = 191 in survey sample

The majority of respondents were between 25 and 45 years old (N = 144). More than half were under 35 years old (N = 109). The respondents were predominantly female (male = 6).

Results

1. Experience and commitment of Directors

How experienced are Directors? How long have they been in their present position? How long have they been Directors? How long did they work in the field before becoming Directors? How long do they intend to stay in their present positions?

TABLE 1.1
YEARS IN CURRENT POSITION BY TYPE OF DIRECTOR'S POSITION

Category	Long Day Care		Preschool		Total	
Under 1 year	26	(14%)	14	(7%)	40	(21%)
1–2 years	21	(11%)	16	(8%)	37	(19%)
3–5 years	33	(17%)	42	(22%)	75	(39%)
6 +	16	(8%)	22	(12%)	38	(20%)
Total	96	(51%)	94	(49%)	190	(100%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1.2
YEARS IN FIELD SPENT WORKING AS A DIRECTOR BY DIRECTOR'S POSITION

Category	Long Day Care	Preschool	Total
Under 1 year	18 (9%)	6 (3%)	24 (12%)
1–2 years	13 (7%)	9 (5%)	22 (12%)
3–5 years	35 (18%)	30 (16%)	65 (34%)
6 +	30 (16%)	49 (26%)	79 (42%)
Total	95 (51%)	94 (49%)	190 (100%)

TABLE 1.3
YEARS IN FIELD BEFORE BECOMING A DIRECTOR BY DIRECTOR'S POSITION

Category	Long Day Care	Preschool	Total
Under 1 year	11 (6%)	17 (9%)	28 (15%)
1–2 years	21 (11%)	29 (15%)	50 (26%)
3–5 years	38 (20%)	25 (13%)	63 (33%)
6 +	26 (14%)	23 (12%)	49 (26%)
Total	96 (51%)	94 (49%)	190 (100%)

TABLE 1.4
INTENTION TO REMAIN AS DIRECTOR BY TYPE OF DIRECTOR'S POSITION

Number of years intending to stay in present position	Long Day Care	Preschool	Total
One year from now	30 (17%)	21 (12%)	51 (29%)
Three years from now	30 (17%)	30 (17%)	60 (35%)
Five years from now	26 (15%)	36 (21%)	63 (36%)
Total	86 (49%)	87 (50%)	174 (100%)

Discussion

While the cohort overall has experience in a Director's role (76% of respondents have more than three years directing experience), an astounding 41% of Directors worked in the field for less than two years before taking on the role of Director. It appears that the demand for Directors outweighs the number of experienced staff and that many Directors have 'fallen into' this position with limited background.

The difficulties of moving into the position with relatively little experience in the field was emphasised in follow up interviews which were conducted with 55 Directors. When asked to give advice to students who aspired to take on administrative roles in centres, every Director interviewed (100%) recommended that students should teach at least two years before taking on a Director position. Many of these respondents had learnt this 'the hard way' (by taking on the role themselves before they were ready).

Despite this, the Directors are not only coping but are highly committed to their roles. Although over one quarter of respondents who answered the question about intention to remain at their present positions (N = 174) stated that they did not anticipate being in the same position one year from now, 71% of respondents indicated a commitment to remain in

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

their Director position for at least the next three years. The implication is that, despite identified areas of frustration, the majority of Directors appear to find their positions rewarding enough to envisage staying on.

While 76% of respondents have more than three years directing experience, only 59% have more than three years experience in the same centre. Of the 42% of respondents who have more than six years experience as a Director, only one half of those had been at their present centre for six years or more. Experienced Directors, it appears, have a tendency to change positions.

If, as Caruso and Fawcett suggest, only experienced supervisors are able to provide motivation and leadership to a centre, there is cause for concern that 40% of Directors in this survey have been in their present position for less than three years and that 80% of Directors have been in their present positions for less than six years. The implication is that many staff in child care centres may not be exposed to well experienced, role model Directors who not only possess technical competence but are able to provide inspirational leadership to the centre and to the profession.

2. Training of Directors

How much early childhood training do Directors have? How much administrative training do Directors have? How highly do they value the training they have received?

TABLE 2.1
LEVEL OF TRAINING

Training Specific to Early Childhood Education (ECE)	Total	
Category	No.	%
Two or more years	28	15
Three years	71	37
Over three years	84	44
No training specific to ECE	8	4
Total	191	100

TABLE 2.2
LEVEL OF TRAINING AND TRAINING SPECIFIC TO ADMINISTRATION

Training Specific to Early Childhood Education ECE	Also have Training Specific to Administration (No)
Two or more years	14
Three years	47
Over three years	53
No training specific to ECE	5
Total	119

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2.3
NUMBER OF IN-SERVICE COURSES COMPLETED

Number completed	Number of respondents	%
One	19	40
Two	10	21
Three	12	25
Four	3	6
Five	1	2
Six	2	4
Ten	1	2
Total	48	100

TABLE 2.4
RATING OF TRAINING

- 44% of respondents (N = 87) had taken some administration subjects as part of a degree or diploma.
- 49% of respondents (N = 99) had taken at least one in service course and 6% (N = 11) had taken some other form of administration-related training.
- 46% of those who had taken administration courses as part of their degree or diploma rated these courses as 'mostly useful' or 'very useful' (ratings of 4 or 5 on a Likert scale).
- 70% of those who had taken in-service courses rated these as 'mostly useful' or 'very useful'.
- 21% of those who had taken administration courses as part of a degree or diploma rated these courses as 'not useful at all' or 'not very useful' (ratings of 1 or 2 on a Likert scale).
- 5% of those who had taken in service courses rated these courses as 'not useful at all' or 'not very useful' (rating of 1 or 2 on a Likert scale).

Discussion

Pre-service training

Although administration courses as part of a pre-service degree or diploma have been recommended by a number of sources (Croll, et al., 1993; Whelan, 1993), 21% of those who identified this as their form of administration training rated it to be not useful. A further 33% rated this form of training as being 'somewhat useful' and 46% rated it as 'useful' or 'very useful'.

These ratings are much lower than those given for in-service courses of which 70% were rated to be 'useful' or 'very useful'.

The implication is that management and administration areas have more value when they are taught to practising administrators. Pre-service early childhood education students may be preoccupied with obtaining the knowledge and skills needed to teach and are less likely to understand the importance of administration subjects and/or to find the information relevant. Presumably, when these teachers become administrators (over half of them will not take on a Director's role for three years or longer), some of the course work will be outdated or forgotten.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The undervaluing of degree related administration subjects contradicts a recent report by Dockett (1990). Here, surveyed graduates from an early childhood course at University of Western Sydney, Macarthur, identified management subjects as those most useful to them in their present positions. Since many tertiary institutions may be offering a variety of course work under the rubric of management or administration subjects, research into content of subjects labelled 'useful' and 'less useful' is called for.

In-service training

In-service courses, when accessible, are valued by Directors. However, less than half of the Directors (49%) had taken any inservice course and 40% of these had taken only one. While participation rates seem low, the ratings for the value and usefulness of in service courses were high.

The implication is that Directors, on the whole, do not have access to training in administration and may not, therefore, be fully cognisant of the knowledge base and skills required to fulfil the complex roles of administering a child care centre. Despite their lack of formal training, Directors, as shown by the responses below, do not report feeling unprepared.

3. Preparedness of Directors

How much awareness of the duties and responsibilities of their job did Directors have before assuming the position? What were they most prepared for? What were they least prepared for? How were Directors oriented to their position?

TABLE 3.1
AWARENESS OF DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
BEFORE TAKING ON POSITION

Understanding of Director's position	Number	%
Yes	25	13
Mostly	121	65
Not really	38	20
No	3	2
Total	187	100

TABLE 3.2
ASPECTS OF DIRECTOR'S ROLE MOST UNPREPARED FOR

Aspect	Number of responses
Administration/financial management/waiting lists and enrolments	75
Staff conflicts/issues/management/development	53
Number of hours	49
Being responsible for everything	27
Parental demand	24
Demands from Council/Government Departments or Government policy makers/Committees	21
Ongoing developments	8
Communication	6
Nothing	5
Other	5

Respondents were allowed up to three responses to this question

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3.3
ASPECTS OF DIRECTOR'S ROLE MOST PREPARED FOR

Aspect	Number of responses
General time management and administration/financial management/paperwork	65
Teaching children	51
Staff issues	49
Parents	38
Programming	29
Everything	13
Policy development	7
Responsibility	7
Long hours	3

Respondents were allowed up to three responses to this open-ended question.

TABLE 3.4
HOW MADE AWARE OF ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF POSITION

Aspect	Number of responses
Written job Description	108
Watching my predecessor	77
Formal orientation	43
Informat discussions with employers	103
Informal discussions with others working there	87
Formal or informal discussion with other Directors	110
Through course work at university or elsewhere	51
Through in-services	77
I am learning by myself as issues arise	130
Other	22

Respondents could nominate as many categories as they wishes.

Discussion

Directors appear to know about the parameters of their role. Seventy-eight percent of respondents stated that they had a full understanding about their position, or that they knew most things about it before taking it on. They listed a number of means by which this preparation had taken place including formal and informal discussions with other staff at their centre, with other Directors, through written job descriptions, by watching their predecessor and through in service and university courses. Twenty-two percent of respondents however were not generally aware of all the roles and responsibilities of the Director's position before they took it on and, while only 2% of respondents stated that they had no idea what the position entailed, 130 respondents indicated that they were learning 'by myself as issues arise'.

A large number of Directors, however, was not aware of the substance of their role. In a related finding, the majority of respondents identified technical and human[4] as those which were most 'difficult' for them as new Directors. Other items for which Directors felt unprepared included the number of hours, or workload, and the amount of responsibility placed upon them. Parental demand was also cited as an unexpected pressure upon the new Director.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE 10

However, almost one half of the Directors rated technical and human factors of management as those for which they were best prepared. These are the primary forces which Sergiovanni describes as being associated with running an efficient organisation. The implication is that Directors, who come from the pool of teachers, have not had a chance to orient themselves to basic management functions prior to taking on an administrative position. Sergiovanni claims that these princapal functions of management have a generic base and are, thus, most easily learnt. Management functions which address client issues and public relations are more reliant upon content knowledge of the service (Sergiovanni, 1984). The implication is that a good generic manager can learn the 'trade' at the more basic levels of the management hierarchy, but a solid grounding in early childhood training and experience is needed to 'lead' in the higher areas. Perhaps Directors who felt most prepared at technical and human levels are those with less confidence in the knowledge base relating to early childhood education and vice versa. This theory warrants further investigation.

4. Recruitment and Selection

How did Directors achieve their positions? Why did they become Directors?

TABLE 4.1
HOW ACHIEVED POSITION

How achieved position	Number	%
Appointed	50	27
Applied	115	62
Other	20	11
Total	185	100

TABLE 4.2
REASONS STATED FOR BECOMING A DIRECTOR

Reason	Number	%
I was inspired by a role model	20	11
I felt I was a good leader	29	16
I wanted a change from teaching/a challenge	62	34
It seemed like a great job	10	6
To improve my salary	9	5
Just fell into it	25	14
To help out when no one else was available	5	3
Other	23	13
Total	183	100

Discussion

Perhaps the most critical data uncovered by this research is the reported reasons for becoming a Director. Very few are doing it 'for the salary' (5%). Sixty-seven percent of respondents were motivated to pursue their positions because of their desire for a change/challenge or because of positive impressions about the job or inspiration from a specific role model (11%). Twenty-two percent stated that they achieved the position by default and/or that increased benefits were motivating factors. Of these, 17% did not seem to aspire to a Director role but 'fell into it' or took it on when no one else was available.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The majority of Directors applied for their position and won a competition according to normal recruiting practices. Almost one third of respondents, however, were appointed to their positions without going through competition processes.

These data have some important implications. Firstly, it has shown that hygiene factors, such as salary, do not seem to be a major motivator for Directors. Secondly, they reveal that role models who can inspire and mentor new Directors are an important factor in recruiting to this role. Thirdly, it indicates areas in need of support. Despite the fact that specific training and credentials have not been available to Directors in New South Wales, a number have not only succeeded as Directors but have served as an inspiration to others. This pool of 'mentors' needs to be recognised, supported and rewarded to ensure their continued patronage to the field. Likewise, the Directors who 'fell into their role' or assumed it reluctantly are in need of training and other support mechanisms.

CONCLUSIONS

This study has identified the importance of a focus on the role of the Director in early childhood services and has provided base line data on the state and status of professionals presently occupying that role.

Sound management/administration practices reduce staff discontent, decrease turnover, create increased respect and status for the profession and significantly influence the quality of service delivery. Despite its importance, the Director's function in child care settings in Australia tends, still, to be considered as an extension of the 'head' teacher role. Child care administration has not been recognised as a skill area separate from teaching in child care centres and, as such, has not been allotted sufficient credentialising, recognition or rewards (Hayden, 1996).

One outstanding finding from this study is that administration in early childhood, while onerous and stressful, appears to be carried out by a committed group of professionals. Notwithstanding the long hours, the low pay and the lack of status and recognition, 71% of surveyed administrators in New South Wales stated that they anticipated remaining in their role for the next three years or longer. Research has shown that the nature of the work — particularly working with children and clients — is identified as being highly rewarding, despite other frustrations (Hayden, 1996).

Nonetheless, the expansion of child care facilities and the increasing complexity of administration functions is exacerbating the need to provide support for existing administrators and to develop an infrastructure whereby the pool of potential administrators is enlarged. The establishment of a post training certificate is seen as one way to develop the specialist image which this activity demands.[5]

Recognition of needs and development of programs can do much to ameloriate conditions in the field. There is a critical need for flexible, accessible in-service type courses of training for Directors and for a review of a career ladder, credentials and other reward systems which could inspire more commitment to the distinct role of administration. The constraints to the broad realisation of training of leaders in child care settings are great. Despite stated need by vast numbers of administrators and observers, the training programs may be too expensive and too exclusive of policy and other supports to be feasible as a widespread practice.

Final note

While much work is needed in this area, it is hoped that the information in this study has provided a preliminary step in the development of a quality oriented infrastructure for child care Directors. The most encouraging aspect of the research has been the identification of a strong foundation, upon which these infrastructures can be built, and of a group of committed and relatively well trained professionals, who overlook some of the less attractive hygiene factors of their position and reap satisfaction from the more intangible aspects of the work

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

itself. With such a dedicated group, the effort to support further development will not be wasted.

REFERENCES

Broinowski, I (1991. *Excellence in child care centres: A matter of management.* Paper presented at the Australian Early Childhood Association, Inc., Triennial Conference, Adelaide.

Caruso, J (1991). Supervisors in early childhood programs: An emerging profile. *Young Children,* September, 20–26.

Croll, J, Lewis, G, Kelly, J & Godhard, T (1993). Functions of the Director and quality of care in long day care centres. *Viewpoint*, March.

Dockett, S (1991). *The early childhood program at UWS, Macarthur.* University of Western Sydney, Macarthur.

Galinsky, E (1986). What really constitutes quality care? *Child Care Information Exchange*, 41–47, September.

Hayden, J (1996). *Management of Early Childhood Service: An Australian Perspective.* Sydney: Social Science Press.

Herzberg, F (1975). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review:* On Management. New York: Harper and Row, 361–377.

Howes, C, Phillip, D & Whitebook, M (1992). Threshholds of quality: Implications for the social development of children in centre based child care. *Child Development,* 63:449–460.

Johnston, A (1989). Staff turnover — A survey of how it affected 104 NSW long day care centres. *Rattler*, 9:8–13.

Jorde Bloom, P (1992). The child care Director: A critical component of program quality. *Educational Horizons,* Spring, 138–143.

Kelly, J, Croll, J & Godhard, T (1989). What's next to do? The components of long day care Directors' jobs. *Rattler*, Autumn, 9:12–15.

Kontos, S & Fiene, R (1987). Child care quality: compliance with regulations and children's development: The Pennsylvania study. In D Phillips (ed.), *Quality in Child Care: What does the Research Tell Us?*, Washington: NAEYC, 57–59.

Marx, E & Granger, R (1990). Analysis of salary enhancement efforts in New York. *Young Children*, March, 53–59.

Morris, M (1981). The public school as workplace: The principal as key element in teacher satisfaction. *Technical Report Series, No. 32.* Washington: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Neugebaeur, R (1989). When friction flares — Dealing with staff conflict. *Child Care Exchange*, February, 3–6.

Peters, T & Waterman, R (1982). *In Search of Excellence.* New York: Warner Books.

Phillips, D (ed.) (1987). *Quality in Child Care: What does the Research Tell Us?* Washington: NAEYC.

Roupp, R, Travers, J Glantz, F & Coelen, C (1979). *Children at the Centre: Final Report of the National Day Care Study.* Cambridge: ABT Associates.

Ryan, P (1989). *Caring for a Living.* Ottawa: Canadian Child Day Care Federation.

Schom-Moffit, P (1991). *Caring for a Living*. Ottawa: Canadian Child Day Care Federation.

Sheerer, M & Jorde Bloome, P (1990). The on-going challenge: attracting and retaining quality staff. *Child Care Information Exchange*, April, 11–16.

Simons, J (1986). *Administering Early Childhood Services*. Sydney: Sydney College of Advanced Education.

Sarros, J & Sarros, A (1987). Predictors of teacher burn out. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 25 (2), 216–230.

Whelan, A (1993). *Paying the Price: An analysis of staff turnover in long day care and preschool services in NSW — 1990*. Sydney: Community Child Care Coop.

Whitebook, M, Howes, C, Phillips, D & Pemberton, C (1989). Who cares? Child care teachers and the quality of care in America. *Young Children*, 45 (1), 41–45.

NOTES

1. Further findings from this study which incorporate analyses of Directors' roles and functions; supports available to Directors; the degree and role of change for Directors and specified training needs are reported in Hayden, 1996.

2. Herzberg delineates two kinds of motivators for employees. *Hygiene* factors relate to the work environment and include 'perks' such as salary, office conditions, ascetics of the work place, status of the job. *Motivators* are factors which relate to the nature of the job — rather than the context in which it takes place. Motivators include ability to grow with the job, challenging activities, decision making responsibility and recognition for achievement. (Herzberg, 1975).

3. Interview findings did not differ from survey results. They did provide additional qualitative data which have been incorporated into the discussion/results sections of this paper.

4. This statement refers to a finding which is not reported in this paper. Respondents were asked to delineate their activies in terms of four categories (adapted from the 'hierarchy of management forces', Sergiovanni, 1984) and then to state which group of activities they found to be most difficult, most time consuming, most important and most rewarding.

   The categories were:

   Technical functions: relating to the operations of the centre — purchasing, budgeting, record keeping, filling out forms, writing reports.

   Staffing functions: dealing with staff and related issues such as recruitment, orientation and training, staff conflict, staff appraisals, scheduling.

   Client oriented functions: dealing with children and families; programming, planning, addressing quality of care issues, individual attention.

   Public relations: networking, dealing with the community and officials, providing a positive image, 'selling' the centre to parents and others, planning events such as open day. (See Hayden, 1996.)

5. The Canberra Institute of Technology has, since February 1995, been offering a *Graduate Certificate in Child Care Service Management*. This is the first and only such course in Australia to date.

AUTHOR

Dr Jacqueline Hayden is Senior Lecturer and Coordinator of the Master of Teaching (Early Childhood) course at University of Western Sydney, Nepean.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE